

United States Patent and Trademark Office



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTE

aaress: C	OMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P	.O. Box 1450
	lexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
	ww.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/529,649	10/11/2005	Giovanni Pozzi	2965-195	1389	
6449	7590 08/09/2006	EXAMINER			
	L, FIGG, ERNST & N	BERCH, MARK L			
1425 K STREET, N.W. SUITE 800 WASHINGTON, DC 20005			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			1624		
			DATE MAILED: 08/09/2006		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)				
		10/529,649	POZZI ET AL.				
	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
		Mark L. Berch	1624				
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication or Reply	n appears on the cover shee	et with the correspondence a	ddress			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).							
Status							
1)	Responsive to communication(s) filed on _						
		This action is non-final.					
′=	•		natters, prosecution as to th	e merits is			
-,	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Dispositi	on of Claims						
4)⊠	Claim(s) 1-12 is/are pending in the applica	ation.					
•	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.						
	Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
'=	Claim(s) <u>1-10 and 12</u> is/are rejected.						
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	Claim(s) 11 is/are objected to.		,				
*	Claim(s) are subject to restriction a	nd/or election requirement.					
Applicati	on Papers						
	The specification is objected to by the Exar	miner	,				
· ·	The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)		to by the Evaminer	•			
.0,	Applicant may not request that any objection to	, ,	•				
		• • •	•	ED 1 121/d)			
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.							
	inder 35 U.S.C. § 119			. • . • . •			
12\ \	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for for	eign priority under 35 H S (C & 110(a) (d) or (f)				
	•	eigh phonty under 33 0.3.	C. 9 119(a)-(d) of (1).				
α _{/k}	a)⊠ All b) Some * c) None of: 1.⊠ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.						
			n Application No				
	2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No						
	3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).						
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.							
	· ·	and the same same sopies					
AAA			•				
Attachment(s)							
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date							
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)							
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 6)							

Art Unit: 1624

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1, 3-4, 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by 6093814.

See example 4, which provides for a process making the R2=trityl, R1=H material.

Note that the initial acylation, using the tritylated acylating agent, is done using 44.0 mmol of the cephalosporin, and 88.0 mmol of the tributyl amine. Half of the amine will be consumed in the acylation process, meaning that some or all the remaining amine will be there to produce the salt, i.e. the tributyl ammonium salt or tritylated cefdinir. Thus, the material that exists just prior to adding the toluene sulfonic acid is in fact a solution of the tributyl ammonium salt of tritylated cefdinir, anticipating the claims.

With regard to claim 12, examples 6-8 show the conversion to cefdinir. The process of the reference has the additional step of going through the solvate of Formula II, but claim 12 has "comprises", so it is open-ended with regard to additional steps.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112: The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112: The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact

Art Unit: 1624

terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 1, 3, 5-10, 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The term "acyl" is indefinite. Does this embrace acids of S? P? As? What does the stem look like, i.e. if the acyl is e.g. RC(O), what is R? The traverse is unpersuasive. Applicants have provided several references, and their diversity is evidence that the term has not one generally accepted meaning. The McGraw Hill reference, cited in the remarks, says that this is RCO, where R is aliphatic, alicyclic or aromatic. That would exclude HCO, since H is none of these. However, applicants have said in their remarks that HCO is indeed intended, and in fact, claim 2 names it. Thus, applicants are submitting a reference which contradicts their own assertion. This definition would also exclude ClC(O) or HOC(O). The Condensed Chemical Dictionary reference is broader, covering any organic radical, and thus would include something like ClC(O), as chloroformic acid is considered an organic acid. The Wikipedia reference is even broader, because it is not limited to RCO at all. The reference names "sulfonic acids, phosphonic acid and some others". Thus, applicants have provided references which themselves show that there is no one generally accepted meaning, but an assortment of meanings. What about CH₃C(S)-? CH₃C(O)O-?

Claims 1-10, 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The claims refer to adducts. What kind of adducts? Adducts with what?

Art Unit: 1624

Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, paragraphs 1 and 2, as the claimed invention is not described, or is not described in such full, clear, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to make and use the same, and/or failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as his invention. Specifically:

Claim 12 is either written wrong (paragraph 2) or is not enabled as written (paragraph 1). If the salt has its protecting groups removed, it will give the alt of cefdinir, not cefdinir itself. Applicants must either add a step to get cefdinir, or must change the preamble so that it is a synthesis of cefdinir.

Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The term "providing" is unclear. Does it mean preparing, and if so, preparing it from what? If not, what does it mean. If it is simply the starting material for the deprotection process, then the claim should be composed in those terms, written as a method of use, or a synthesis step in which Formula I is the starting material.

Claims 1-10, 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for other forms, does not reasonably provide enablement for solvates. The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make the invention commensurate in scope with these claims.

The claims, insofar as they embrace solvates are not enabled. The examples presented all failed to produce a solvate. The evidence of the specification is thus clear:

Art Unit: 1624

These compounds do not possess the property of forming solvates; there is no evidence that such compounds even exist. These cannot be simply willed into existence. As was stated in *Morton International Inc. v. Cardinal Chemical Co.*, 28 USPQ2d 1190 "The specification purports to teach, with over fifty examples, the preparation of the claimed compounds with the required connectivity. However ... there is no evidence that such compounds exist... the examples of the '881 patent do not produce the postulated compounds... there is ... no evidence that such compounds even exist." The same circumstance appears to be true here: there is no evidence that solvates of these compounds actually exist; if they did, they would have formed. Hence, applicants must show that solvates can be made, or limit the claims accordingly.

Applicants' attention is called to US 20060094703, which appears to have the same substituted matter as here. Applicants are invited to comment on whether they believe that an interference may become appropriate.

Claim Objections

Claim 11 is objected to as lacking its final period.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mark L. Berch whose telephone number is 571-272-0663. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 7:15 - 3:45. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, James O. Wilson can be reached on (571)272-0661. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private

Art Unit: 1624

Page 6

PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pairdirect.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Mark L. Berch
Primary Examiner Art Unit 1624

8/2/06